

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11-15 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11 are amended, claims 4 and 10 are canceled with out prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter found therein, and claims 12-15 are added. Claims 1, 8, 9, and 11 are amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 4. No new matter has been added.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Ye in the February 7, 2006, personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Anderson, U.S. Patent No. 6,215,523. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

During the interview Applicant's representative discussed the differences between Applicants claimed subject matter and the disclosure of Anderson. In particular, Anderson fails to disclose a control device that displays on the display device an image based upon the second image data which have been read and sustains display of the image having been displayed based upon the second image data on the display device even after the read of the first image has been completed, as recited in claims 1 and 8, and similarly, in claims 9 and 11.

At the interview, the Examiner maintained his position as alleged in the Office Action that Anderson may disclose a control device (410) that sustains the display of the image based upon the second image data at the display device even after the read of the first image has been completed (e.g., scrennail images 608 are continually displayed in the LCD screen 402 until the user releases the buttons 410, see col. 13, lines 20-25). Applicant traverses this assertion and respectfully submits that the Office Action has misconstrued the disclosure of Anderson.

As discussed at the interview, in Anderson, if the user presses and holds down the left/right buttons 410 in step 806 (Fig. 11A), then a series of screenail images 608 are continually decompressed and displayed in the LCD screen 402 in step 808 (Fig. 11B) until the user releases the button (col. 13, lines 19-24). But, the screenail images 608 are only displayed in the LCD screen 402 while the button 410 is pressed. As Anderson describes, after the button is released, whichever image is currently being displayed becomes the selected image, and the compressed image data 604 corresponding to the selected image is fetched from the image file 600 and decompressed and resized to fit the display in step 810 (col. 13, lines 25-29). As the compressed image 604 of Anderson is being decompressed, the screenail image 608 in the LCD screen 402 is updated with decompressed image block by block in step 812 (Fig. 11A; col. 13, lines 29-33).

However, Anderson does not disclose that each of the screenail images 608 is sustained even after the read of the corresponding compressed image data 604 has been completed.

Further, as Anderson describes, a screenail image 608 displayed on the LCD 402 is updated with the higher resolution compressed image data 811, which replaces the screenail 809 (col. 8, lines 25-31; col. 13, lines 29-37). This means that the screenail image 608 is not sustained after the read of the higher resolution compressed image data 604 has been completed.

With respect to claim 6, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that the concept of enlargement as recited in claim 6 may correspond to decompression as describe by Anderson. Anderson decompresses and resizes the compressed image data 604 so that the screenail image 608 is updated with the corresponding image data 604 on the screen (Figs. 11A and 11B). The enlargement of display is completely different from the decompression of compressed data. Anderson does not disclose that the control device performs the enlarged

display of the image displayed at the display device based upon the second image data by using the first image data which have been read, as recited in claim 6 and likewise, as recited in added claim 14.

Applicant's electronic camera as recited in claims 6 and 14 includes an enlargement instruction device that issues an instruction for enlarged display of the image displayed at the display device base upon the second image data in which the control device performs the enlarged display of the image displayed at the display device based upon the second image data by using the first image data which have been read. Thus, since VGA image data corresponding to the display resolution at the display monitor are recorded in the memory card when recording a photographic image and this VGA image is displayed during a single frame reproduction display, the quality of the image is clearly improved over the enlarged display of a thumbnail image implemented in the prior art giving the impression as if the main image were on display (page 22, line 24 - page 23, line 6 of the specification). As a result, the frame feed operation is preformed without waiting for the main image read to be completed, to achieve a continuous display operation with a high degree of efficiency (page 23, lines 6-9 of the specification). Anderson fails to disclose these features or achieve these advantages.

With respect to added claim 13, claim 13 is based upon original claims 1, 5, and amended claim 7. Accordingly, contrary to the Office Action assertion that Anderson discloses features of claim 7 (col. 8, lines 20-38 of Anderson), Anderson only discloses that the currently selected thumbnail image is resized to generate the larger resized thumbnail 704 by multiplying the thumbnail image 606 by a multiplication factor in review mode (col. 11, lines 10-16; col. 11, line 62, col. 12, line 3). The larger sized thumbnail 704 is not based upon scrennail image 608 in review mode of Anderson. Also, Anderson does not disclose

any thumbnail in play mode. Accordingly, Anderson does not disclose a camera as recited in new claim 13.


Thus, Anderson does not disclose each and every feature of claims 1, 8, 9, 11 and added claim 13 and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is inappropriate. Further, for at least the reasons discussed above, Anderson does not suggest the subject matter of claims 1, 8, 9, 11, and 13.

Because Anderson does not anticipate or suggest the subject matter of claims 1, 8, 9, 11 and likewise, claim 13, Anderson cannot possibly anticipate or suggest the subject matter of claims 2-3, 5-7, and 12, which depend from claim 1, and likewise, the subject matter of claims 14 and 15, which depend from claim 13, for the reasons discussed with respect to claims 1 and 13 and for the additional features recited therein. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11-15 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Kurt P. Goudy
Registration No. 52,954

MAC:KPG/tbm

Date: March 2, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
